

REMARKS

Entry of the present amendments is respectfully requested. Reconsideration and allowance are also respectfully requested.

Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1-4 and 6-26 would be pending. Upon entry of this Amendment, claim 5 would be canceled, claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 11, and 13 would be amended, and new claims 14-26 would be added. No new matter has been added.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 5-10 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant has effectively rewritten claim 5 in independent form by incorporating the features of now-canceled claim 5 into claim 4.

The specification has been amended only to correct typographical errors. The majority of the changes correct the reference number of the second feeding lead wire, which should properly be "14b" as used for example, on page 14, line 12 of the specification, and in Figures 1 and 2. Figure 3 is also amended to correct a similar typographical error. No new matter has been added.

Summary of Objections and Rejections

Claim 1 is objected to for a minor informality. Claim 1 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner to overcome the objection. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the suggestion.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over JP 07-272694 A ("Hiromitsu") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,929,564 to Nakaya et al. ("Nakaya"). Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hiromitsu in view of Nakaya, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,753,036 to Roche ("Roche"). Claims 4 and 11-13 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,179,640 to Larson et al. ("Larson") in view of Roche.

Discussion of Rejected Claims

Preliminarily, it should be clarified that Applicant's discussion in the Amendment filed April 7, 2003 (on page 3, last line, to page 4, line 10, and on page 5, lines 3-7 and 11-13), of advantages and embodiments that may be associated with the structures of various claims were merely illustrative and are not required by the claims. Accordingly, the claims are intended to also cover structures other than the noted embodiments, and structures within the scopes of the claims are not required to be able to realize the noted advantages.

Turning to the language of the claims, independent claim 1 is amended to clarify that the inner electrode is arranged at one end in a glass tube. In particular, it has been clarified that the inner electrode is arranged at a single end of the tube in claim 1. Neither Hiromitsu nor Nakaya, either alone or in any combination, teach or suggest such an inner electrode. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 1 as amended is allowable over these references.

Claims 2 and 3, which depend from claim 1, are also allowable over Hiromitsu and Nakaya for at least those reasons that claim 1 is allowable, and further in view of the additional features recited therein.

Independent claim 4 is amended to incorporate all of the features of now-canceled claim 5. Namely, claim 4 is amended to recite that the end of the second feeding lead wire buried in the other sealing portion of the glass tube is not exposed to the inside of the glass tube. Since claim 5 has been

considered by the Examiner to contain allowable subject matter, it is respectfully submitted that claim 4 as amended is allowable.

Claims 6-10, which depend from claim 4, are also allowable for at least those reasons that claim 4 is allowable, and further in view of the additional features recited therein.

Independent claim 11 is also allowable for at least similar reasons as those discussed above with regard to claim 4, and further in view of the various differing features recited therein.

Claims 12 and 13, which depend from claim 11, are also allowable for at least those reasons that claim 11 is allowable, and further in view of the additional features recited therein.

New Claims

It is believed that new claims 14-26 are allowable over the art of record. For example, the art of record fails to teach or suggest a fluorescent lamp, comprising an elongated sealed tube containing a gas discharge medium, a fluorescent layer being disposed on an inner surface of the tube; an inner electrode disposed along a portion of the tube and exposed to the discharge medium; an outer electrode disposed at least partially around the tube; and an engaging member at least partially buried in the other end of the tube and mechanically coupled to the outer electrode, the fluorescent lamp configured such that a voltage applied across the inner and outer electrodes causes a current to pass between the inner and outer electrodes, thereby causing the fluorescent layer to fluoresce, as recited in independent claim 14.

Nor does the art of record teach or suggest a lamp, comprising a sealed tube containing a discharge medium; an inner electrode extending only partially through an inside of the tube; and an


outer electrode wound at least partially around the tube, the outer electrode being wound at a varying winding pitch depending upon a distance between the outer electrode and the inner electrode, as recited in independent claim 25.

Conclusion

All of the objections and rejections having been addressed, Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance, and notification as to this is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner feel that a telephone call or personal interview would expedite prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number below.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: September 15, 2003


for Joseph M. Potenza
Reg. No. 28,175

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
Eleventh Floor
1001 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597
(202) 824-3000

Attorney Docket No.: 004476.00003
U.S. Serial No.: 09/787,357

APPENDIX